

Saint-Prest (northern France): further evidence of human presence in north-western Europe around 1 Ma?

Amélie Vialet, Anne-Marie Moigne, Marie-Helene Moncel

▶ To cite this version:

Amélie Vialet, Anne-Marie Moigne, Marie-Helene Moncel. Saint-Prest (northern France): further evidence of human presence in north-western Europe around 1 Ma?. ESHE, 2022, Tübingen, Germany. hal-03820420

HAL Id: hal-03820420 https://hal.science/hal-03820420

Submitted on 19 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Saint-Prest (northern France): further evidence of human presence in north-western Europe around 1 Ma?

A. VIALET¹, M.H. MONCEL¹, A.M. MOIGNE¹

¹Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, UMR 7194 du CNRS – Histoire naturelle de l'Homme préhistorique, Université de Perpignan - UPVD, Paris France







Evidences of human presence around the Mediterranean Sea and location of the Saint-Prest site, from Muttoni et al. QSR 2018

Fossils from the Saint-Prest site: *Bison shoetensacki* boney ankle (a), mandible of Alces carnutorum (b), left maxillary bone of Pachycrocuta brevirostris (c), mandible of the type specimen of *M. m. depereti* (d), longueur : 31 cm.

Settings

In the middle of the 19th century, numerous bones of large mammals (Mammuthus meridionalis, Hippopotamus antiquus, Bison schoetensacki, Pachycrocuta *brevirostris...*) were discovered at Saint-Prest, in a quarry in the Eure valley, north-east of Chartres. For palaeontologists, this site remains a reference as several types have been described there such as Cervalces carnutorum and Trogontherium cuvieri boisvilletti (Laugel 1862) or Mammuthus meridionalis depereti (Coppens and Beden 1982). More recently, a geological and taxonomic revision has been carried out confirming the attribution of the faunal assemblage to the epi-Villafranchian, between 800 ka and 1.2 Ma [1].

However, one question remains unanswered: is there a human presence on the site? As no human remains have been found, they can only be attested by indirect

evidences: artefacts and/or cut-marks on animal bones. The latter were described as early as 1863 by E. Desnoyers [2], giving rise to lively debates that led to mistrust of the site and ultimately to its being forgotten.



Above: cut marks identified on a scapula of Mammoth (left) and on a femoral head of Bison (right) Below: 3 flakes and 1 fragment of flint corresponding to the lithic tools from the Saint-Prest site described by the Abbey Bourgeois [4] – coll. Musée d'Archéologie Nationale, Saint-Germain-en-Laye

Revision of the faunal and lithic material

As part of a multi-disciplinary research program, we sought to locate the collections dispersed in various public and private institutions and conducted an archaeozoological analysis of the material identified [3]. Concerning the lithic material, only the 4 flint flakes published by the Abbey Bourgeois [4] and now preserved in the Musée d'archéologie nationale, could be discussed to assess human passages. Concerning the fauna, out of about 600 fossils examined, 5 to 10 traces could be considered as anthropic cut-marks. The evidence is therefore scarce to attest a hominin presence in Saint-Prest around 1 Ma. However, in the pene-contemporaneous sites, particularly around the Mediterranean basin and in the Yunxian site in China, traces of cut-marks are often rare as well. Thus, the Saint-Prest site, along with those of Happisburgh 3 and Pakefield in UK, could testify the earliest human occupations in Western Europe in their northernmost extension.



References

[1] Guérin et al. 2003, Géobios, p.55-82 ; [2] Desnoyers, 1863, Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, p.1073-1083 ; [3] Vialet et al. 2021, Mérgoil éditions, p.97-113 ; [4] Bourgeois 1867, Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, p.47-48